

## **REMARKS**

Applicant is in receipt of the Office Action mailed October 13, 2010. Claims 1, 3-13, 15 and 18-28 were pending in the application, and were rejected. Claims 1, 3-13, 15, 18-25, 27 and 28 have been amended. Reconsideration of the case is requested in light of the following remarks.

### **Interview Summary**

Applicant respectfully thanks the Examiner for the interview conducted on January 11, 2011. In the interview the Examiner pointed out that the specification mentions that in some embodiments the requesting program may execute on a different computer system than the computer system on which the graphical program is stored. Applicant agreed to amend the claims to include this limitation.

Applicant also pointed out that the prior art does not teach other limitations recited in the claims, as further discussed below.

The Examiner also mentioned that in certain places the specification refers to the graphical program's "calling information," whereas the claims refer to "information specifying the invocation interface" of the graphical program. Applicant notes that these terms are used interchangeably. The specification states:

The interface information for the graphical program may include information necessary to invoke execution of the graphical program. Thus, the interface information is also referred to herein as "calling information". (*p. 5, lines 4-6*)

### **Claim Objections**

The Examiner objected to claim 19 as being a dependent claim that did not indicate its parent claim. Applicant has amended claim 19 to refer to claim 15 as the parent claim.

### **Section 102 Rejection**

Claims 1, 3-13, 15 and 18-28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kudukoli et al (US 20010020291, “Kudukoli”). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

As discussed in the telephone interview, Applicant has amended claim 1 to recite the additional limitation of, “wherein the graphical program is stored on a first computer system, wherein the requesting program executes on a second different computer system.” Applicant respectfully submits that Kudukoli does not teach at least receiving from a requesting program a request to determine an invocation interface of a graphical program, where the graphical program is stored on a first computer system, and where the requesting program executes on a second different computer system, as recited in the amended claim 1. Applicant also notes that the specification actually describes embodiments where the graphical program is stored on the same computer system on which the requesting program executes. See p. 16, line 17 – p. 17, line 16. Applicant respectfully submits that the previously submitted claims were patentably distinct even without the new limitation recited above. Nevertheless, Applicant has amended the claims in the current application to include the above-recited limitation, as suggested by the Examiner. Applicant may elect to pursue the original subject matter in a continuation application.

Applicant notes that the other independent claims have been amended similarly. For example, the amended claim 15 recites, “wherein the program instructions are stored on a first computer system” and “wherein the graphical program is stored on a second computer system different from the first computer system”.

Applicant also respectfully submits that Kudukoli does not teach several other limitations recited in the claims. Kudukoli relates generally to a graphical program generation (GPG) program. The GPG program executes to programmatically generate a new graphical program. For example, in some embodiments the GPG program receives user input specifying desired program functionality and then generates a new graphical program to implement the specified functionality. In other embodiments the GPG program uses an existing graphical program as input and translates the existing graphical

program into a new graphical program, e.g., by generating a new graphical program that can be executed in a different graphical programming environment than the original graphical program. Kudukoli teaches that the GPG program may generate the new graphical program by including nodes in the new graphical program and connecting them together. The GPG program may also configure the nodes in the new graphical program, which may include configuring parameters for the nodes.

Referring now to the present claims, claim 15 recites, “receive the information specifying the invocation interface of the graphical program in response to the request, wherein receiving the information includes receiving information specifying one or more parameters that should be passed to the graphical program when invoking execution of the graphical program”. The Examiner has interpreted the recited “graphical program” in claim 15 as an existing graphical program which is translated by Kudukoli’s GPG program. However, there is no mention in Kudukoli about receiving information specifying one or more parameters that should be passed to the existing graphical program when invoking execution of the existing graphical program. Likewise, Kudukoli fails to teach the recited limitation of “invoke execution of the graphical program using the received information specifying the invocation interface of the graphical program, wherein said invoking includes passing the one or more parameters to the graphical program”. Kudukoli simply teaches that the existing graphical program is translated into a new graphical program. Kudukoli is not concerned with invoking execution of the existing graphical program by passing one or more parameters to the existing graphical program and does not teach these limitations.

Applicant thus respectfully submits that claim 15 is further patentably distinct over Kudukoli for the additional reasons discussed above. Inasmuch as the other independent claims recite features similar to those of claim 15 discussed above, Applicant respectfully submits that the other independent claims are also patentably distinct over Kudukoli.

## **CONCLUSION**

Applicant submits the application is in condition for allowance, and an early notice to that effect is requested.

If any extensions of time (under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136) are necessary to prevent the above-referenced application(s) from becoming abandoned, Applicant(s) hereby petition for such extensions. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees which may be required or credit any overpayment to Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert & Goetzel P.C., Deposit Account No. 50-1505/5150-75401/JCH.

Also filed herewith are the following items:

- ☐ Request for Continued Examination
- ☐ Terminal Disclaimer
- ☐ Power of Attorney By Assignee and Revocation of Previous Powers
- ☐ Notice of Change of Address
- ☐ Other:

Respectfully submitted,

/Jeffrey C. Hood/

Jeffrey C. Hood, Reg. #35198  
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT(S)

Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert & Goetzel PC  
P.O. Box 398  
Austin, TX 78767-0398  
Phone: (512) 853-8800  
Date: 2011-01-13 JCH/JLB